

CONNECTICUT LAW JOURNAL



Published in Accordance with
General Statutes Section 51-216a

VOL. LXXX No. 11

September 11, 2018

274 Pages

Table of Contents

CONNECTICUT REPORTS

Hartford v. CBV Parking Hartford, LLC, 330 C 200	64
<i>Eminent domain; challenge to statement of compensation filed by plaintiff city; claim that city's appeal was moot because it challenged only one of two independent grounds that supported trial court's fair market value determination; whether trial court improperly valued property on basis of unreasonable assumption that defendants would assemble their parcels with adjoining properties owned by city for development; whether trial court improperly awarded interest pursuant to statute (§ 37-3c) at rate of 7.22 percent and offer of compromise interest.</i>	
Smith v. Rudolph, 330 C 138	2
<i>Action pursuant to statute (§ 52-556) waiving sovereign immunity when person is injured due to negligence of state employee while that employee is operating motor vehicle owned and insured by state; right to jury trial; motion to strike case from jury trial list; claim that trial court incorrectly determined that § 52-556 did not afford plaintiff right to jury trial; whether trial court properly struck plaintiff's case from jury trial list; whether § 52-556 expressly provides for right to jury trial.</i>	
State v. Taupier, 330 C 149	13
<i>Threatening first degree; breach of peace second degree; disorderly conduct; motion to dismiss; claim that threatening statements directed toward Superior Court judge in e-mail sent to others constituted protected speech under federal and state constitutions; claim that first degree threatening statute (§ 53a-61aa [a] [3]) was unconstitutional under free speech provisions of federal and state constitutions because statute did not require state to prove that defendant, in threatening to commit crime of violence, had specific intent to terrorize target of threatening statements; claim that first amendment requires higher mens rea for threatening speech directed at public official; whether trial court's consideration of evidence regarding certain events following defendant's threatening statement constituted reversible error; whether evidence was sufficient to support defendant's convictions of threatening in first degree and disorderly conduct; indirect communication of threats through third parties, discussed.</i>	
Volume 330 Cumulative Table of Cases	95

CONNECTICUT APPELLATE REPORTS

A Better Way Wholesale Autos, Inc. v. Gause, 184 CA 643	81A
<i>Arbitration; application to vacate arbitration award pursuant to statute (§ 52-418 [a] [4]); motion to confirm award; claim that appeal was moot because plaintiff failed to oppose motion to confirm award; whether plaintiff could have obtained practical relief through reversal of trial court's decision denying application to vacate award; claim that arbitrator's award of punitive damages constituted manifest disregard of law pursuant to § 52-418 (a) (4); whether arbitrator acted within his discretion in crediting defendant's evidence of certain violations against plaintiff's lack of evidence in rebuttal; whether arbitrator's conclusions indicated extraordinary lack of fidelity to established legal principles.</i>	
Ajluni v. Chainani, 184 CA 650	88A
<i>Contracts; guarantee; statute of limitations (§ 52-276); whether trial court's finding that defendant reaffirmed existence of subject debt, thereby tolling statute of limitations, was clearly erroneous; whether there was adequate evidence in record to support trial court's finding of reaffirmation; whether statements defendant made</i>	

(continued on next page)

- in e-mails to plaintiff unequivocally acknowledged that he owed debt to plaintiff; whether defendant expressed intention not to pay debt.*
- Bisson v. Wal-Mart Stores, Inc., 184 CA 619 57A
Negligence; premises liability; business invitee; constructive notice; whether trial court properly concluded that defendant met its initial burden of establishing absence of genuine issue of material fact with respect to constructive notice element of premises liability action for business invitee; whether trial court properly concluded that plaintiff failed to present evidence demonstrating existence of disputed factual issue as to constructive notice element; reviewability of inadequately briefed claim that presence of snow on ground on day of plaintiff's fall increased defendant's duty to keep its premises in reasonably safe condition.
- Christiana Trust v. Lewis, 184 CA 659 97A
Foreclosure; summary judgment; foreclosure mediation program; claim that trial court improperly granted motion for summary judgment as to liability; whether genuine issue of material fact existed as to whether signature on subject mortgage was that of defendant; whether statements in defendant's affidavit in support of his opposition to motion for summary judgment that he had reviewed subject mortgage and that he had not signed mortgage contradicted evidence submitted by named plaintiff in support of its motion for summary judgment as to liability and gave rise to genuine issue of material fact as to authenticity of signature on mortgage; whether trial court improperly deemed defendant's statements in 2011 bankruptcy proceeding to be judicial admissions binding on court; whether trial court improperly considered defendant's participation in foreclosure mediation program as admissible evidence relating to issue of validity of mortgage.
- Downing v. Dragone, 184 CA 565 3A
Contracts; challenge to trial court's finding that defendant company breached implied in fact contract; whether trial court's finding that named defendant testified that he had written contract on his desk but did not read it until four months after auction was clearly erroneous; whether trial court substantially relied on clearly erroneous factual finding in rendering judgment in part for plaintiff; whether new trial on breach of contract claim was necessary.
- Hirsch v. Woermer, 184 CA 583 21A
Foreclosure; foreclosure by sale; special defense of unconscionability; motion to strike special defenses; motion to open judgment; claim that trial court improperly granted motion to strike special defense of unconscionability; whether defendant sufficiently pleaded facts to support special defense of unconscionability on procedural grounds; whether defendant's assertion that loan was predatory because of term of one year, with interest rate of 15 percent, and points of 5 percent, alone, was sufficient to render contract unenforceable on ground of substantive unconscionability; whether trial court abused its discretion in denying motion to open judgment; whether defendant timely raised special defense of statutory violation; whether special defense was available to defendant prior to when judgment was rendered; whether defendant offered any evidence that there was good and compelling reason for modification to special defenses after judgment was rendered.

(continued on next page)

CONNECTICUT LAW JOURNAL

(ISSN 87500973)

Published by the State of Connecticut in accordance with the provisions of General Statutes § 51-216a.

Commission on Official Legal Publications
 Office of Production and Distribution
 111 Phoenix Avenue, Enfield, Connecticut 06082-4453
 Tel. (860) 741-3027, FAX (860) 745-2178
www.jud.ct.gov

RICHARD J. HEMENWAY, Publications Director

Published Weekly – Available at <https://www.jud.ct.gov/lawjournal>

Syllabuses and Indices of court opinions by
 ERIC M. LEVINE, Reporter of Judicial Decisions
 Tel. (860) 757-2250

The deadline for material to be published in the Connecticut Law Journal is Wednesday at noon for publication on the Tuesday six days later. When a holiday falls within the six day period, the deadline will be noon on Tuesday.

State v. Griffin, 184 CA 595	33A
<i>Arson in first degree; conspiracy to commit arson in first degree; insurance fraud; whether trial court abused its discretion in denying motion to suppress witnesses' identifications of defendant that were made to police from photographic arrays and in court; whether photographic arrays were unduly suggestive; claim that there was increased risk that witnesses would select defendant's photograph from arrays because photographs were administered simultaneously instead of sequentially; whether evidence was insufficient to support conviction of arson in first degree and conspiracy to commit arson in first degree; claim that there was no evidence that defendant started fire with intent to collect insurance proceeds related to mother's homeowner's policy; claim that evidence was insufficient to establish that defendant possessed requisite mens rea to support conspiracy conviction; whether conviction of insurance fraud as to fraudulent insurance claim by defendant's mother could not stand where there was no evidence that defendant participated in making or preparation of any statement that was provided to mother's home insurer.</i>	
State v. Lugojanu, 184 CA 576	14A
<i>Conspiracy to commit home invasion; whether trial court improperly dismissed defendant's motion to correct illegal sentence for lack of subject matter jurisdiction; whether court had jurisdiction to consider defendant's claim that sentence of twenty years of incarceration followed by five year term of probation exceeded statutory twenty year limit for class B felony; claim that sentence was illegal because there was disparity between defendant's sentence and sentences received by other participants in underlying crime; claim that prosecutor improperly increased defendant's recommended sentence under plea deal after defendant elected jury trial.</i>	
State v. Tyus, 184 CA 669	107A
<i>Murder; whether trial court committed error in granting state's motion to join defendant's case and that of another defendant for trial, where both cases arose from same incident, virtually all of state's testimonial, documentary, physical and scientific evidence would have been admissible against each defendant if they were tried separately, each defendant's defenses were not antagonistic and each defendant was other's principal alibi witness; claim that certain statement was inadmissible under coconspirator exception to hearsay rule in applicable provision (§ 8-3 [1]) of Connecticut Code of Evidence (2008), where conspiracy to commit murder count had been dismissed prior to trial; claim that trial court violated defendant's right to confrontation when it permitted state's firearms examiner to testify about firearms evidence that had been examined by examiner who had died and was unavailable for cross-examination; whether trial court improperly denied request for limiting instruction regarding testimony of firearms examiner; whether trial court's jury instructions were correct in law, adapted to issues and sufficient to guide jury.</i>	
Volume 184 Cumulative Table of Cases	125A

SUPREME COURT PENDING CASES

Summaries	1B
---------------------	----

NOTICES OF CONNECTICUT STATE AGENCIES

State Elections Enforcement Commission	1C
Connecticut Higher Education Supplemental Loan Authority	28C

MISCELLANEOUS

Notice of Discipline	1D
Notice of Suspension of Attorney	1D, 2D